### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-5 are now in this application, with Claim 1 being in independent form. Claims 1-3 have been amended and Claims 4 and 5 have been added to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention.

### FORMAL OBJECTIONS

In response to the Examiner's request for an Abstract, Applicants have respectfully submitted the abstract on a separate sheet.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the disclosure for not having a reference numeral in the specification to an "automatic mechanism" as indicated in Claim2, Applicants have amended Claim 2 to replace the term "automatic mechanism" with terms clearly found in the specification at Page 10.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 2 was rejected under Section 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement because of its reference to an "automatic mechanism." In response, Applicants have amended Claim 2 to replace the term "automatic mechanism" with terms found in the specification at Page 10 to more clearly set forth the subject matter of their invention. In view of the above amendments to Claim 2, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been overcome and, therefore, request reconsideration of Claim 2.

The drawings were also objected to for failure to include a reference sign for an "automatic mechanism" mentioned in Claim 2. As stated above, Claim 2 has been amended to replace the term "automatic mechanism" with terms clearly found in the specification at Page 10. Likewise, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection has been obviated.

## Rejection of Claims 1 and 2 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,688,251 (Chanoch).

In response, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to more clearly set forth that the mechanism automatically disengages the drive mechanism from the dose control mechanism when the dose control mechanism is rotated past a maximum value to a predetermined position. After being disengaged at the predetermined position, the dose control mechanism is then free to rotate back to an initial dose position where the drive mechanism and dose control mechanism are then re-engaged and used to set a new dosage on the medication delivery pen. The abovenoted feature of the present invention is not found to be taught or suggested by Chanoch.

Chanoch, in lines 38-62 of Claim 1, is directed to a feature that disengages a driving means from the leadscrew when loading new cartridge in a pen. Such a feature is important when loading a new cartridge, since the new cartridge will contain more medication than the discarded cartridge and, therefore, will require the leadscrew to be reset back to its starting position to begin dispensing from the proper location in the filled new cartridge. The present invention does not relate to replacing a cartridge, but is directed to setting a new dose if and when the user dials in a dose higher than that desired and needs to reset the dialed dose to a lower value.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct over Chanoch for at least the above reasons.

#### Rejection of Claim 3 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over <u>Chanoch</u> in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,858,607 (Jordan et al.).

App. Ser. No. 10/049.655 Amendment dated April 20, 2004 Response to Office Action of October 20, 2003

In response, it is submitted that dependent Claim 3 is patentable since it sets forth additional aspects of the present invention and is dependent from independent Claim 1, discussed above.

Likewise, the remaining dependent Claims 2, 4 and 5 are also believed patentable since they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent Claim 1 discussed above.

# Conclusion

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all objections and rejections are overcome. Thus, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 20, 2004

Alan W. Fiedler

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 33,690 (201) 847-7112

Becton, Dickinson and Company 1 Becton Drive Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417-1880